

Confusion errors in astrometry and counterpart association

David W. Hogg¹

Institute for Advanced Study, Olden Lane, Princeton NJ 08540

hogg@ias.edu

ABSTRACT

In very crowded fields, the modulation of the background by the sea of unresolved faint sources induces centroid shifts. The errors increase with the number of sources per beam. Even the most optimistic simulations of imaging data show that position errors can become severe (on the order of the beam size) at flux levels at which images contain 1/100 to 1/20 sources per beam, depending on the slope of the number-flux relation $d \log N / d \log S$. These problems are expected to be significant for recent observations of faint submillimeter sources and may be the reason that some sources appear to lack optical counterparts.

Subject headings: astrometry — galaxies: photometry — methods: observational — submillimeter — surveys

1. Introduction

Fainter is usually better when it comes to star and galaxy counts. However, there are fundamental limits to faint imaging from confusion which cannot be overcome by increasing exposure times alone. The sea of unresolved sources fainter than the detection limit creates a noise in the sky, which does not improve with more data.

Many of the issues associated with this confusion noise have been discussed before (eg, Scheuer 1957; Condon 1974; Franceschini 1982; Hacking & Houck 1987; Barcons 1992), however the large number of present-day observations that are or soon will be pushing this confusion limit suggests a new discussion. In particular, in recent years there has been a concerted effort to produce very deep, multi-wavelength studies of blank sky in order to identify extragalactic sources as comprehensively as possible. These studies have been very successful, identifying populations of radio-, submillimeter-, infrared-, visual-

¹Hubble Fellow

and x-ray-bright galaxies and associating them with their counterparts in other bands (Djorgovski et al 1995; Williams et al 1996; Hogg et al 1996; Rowan-Robinson et al 1997; Richards et al 1998; Hughes et al 1998; Barger et al 1998; Eales et al 1999; Aussel et al 1999; Elbaz et al 1999; Gardner et al 2000; Brandt et al in preparation; Dickinson et al in preparation). Some of the faintest sources in some of the most crowded fields (in the sense of number of sources per resolution element) have not shown clearly distinguished counterparts at other wavelengths (Hughes et al 1998; Smail et al 1998; Barger et al 1999b). This raises the question “could confusion be playing a role?”

This paper presents simulated images of crowded fields, made in the most optimistic way: no photon noise, a perfectly understood gaussian point spread function or beam shape, pointlike sources, a power-law number–flux relation of known slope, and no angular clustering. Even with these optimistic inputs, the resulting images show that is impossible to accurately measure positions and fluxes of sources that are more than an order of magnitude brighter than the flux level corresponding to one source per beam (a beam being one resolution element in the image). Recent work making use of a “one source per beam” rule (eg, Blain et al 1998) is therefore overly optimistic.

The standard rule-of-thumb is that confusion becomes important at 1/30 of a source per beam. It is possible to get information from the statistics of the background noise fainter than the level of 1/30 source per beam (eg, Scheuer 1957; Condon 1974), but in terms of identifying and measuring individual sources, 1/30 is regarded as the limit. This paper tests the rule-of-thumb for confusion-induced astrometry errors, which are particularly important for deep, multi-wavelength studies, in which counterpart identification across multiple data sets is important. Astrometric shifts due to confusion have been predicted and observed in the context of microlensing data (Goldberg 1998; Goldberg & Woźniak 1998) and are expected to limit future stellar astrometry experiments (Yu et al 1993; Rajagopal & Allen 1999).

For the purposes of this paper a “beam” is taken to be the solid angle of the 1σ -radius circle of the gaussian point spread function, or $\Omega_{\text{beam}} = \pi\sigma^2$. Note that for a gaussian, $\sigma \approx \theta_{\text{FWHM}}/2.35$ where θ_{FWHM} is the angular full width at half-maximum of the point spread function. The number of sources per beam s/b at a given flux level S is the integrated number of sources $N(> S)$ in an image brighter than flux S divided by the number of beams in the solid angle of the image or $(\Omega_{\text{image}}/\Omega_{\text{beam}})$.

2. Method and analysis

Four 512×512 pixel artificial images were made with sources randomly distributed over the image (and in fact over an area larger than the image so that image edges are realistic). The sources were randomly assigned fluxes in power-law distributions $d \log N / d \log S = \beta$ where $\beta = 1.50, 1.00, 0.75$, and 0.50 , one value of β per image. Positions were randomly assigned and were not quantized onto the pixel grid. The point-spread function was chosen to be perfectly gaussian with $\theta_{\text{FWHM}} = 4$ pixels, so that it is well sampled. Each image contains $\Omega_{\text{image}} / \Omega_{\text{beam}} = 2.88 \times 10^4$ beams. The artificial source catalogs were truncated at $s/b = 3$ sources per beam, ie, at much higher angular density than the $s/b \sim 1/30$ sources per beam rule-of-thumb. The four artificial images are shown in Figure 1

No noise was added to the images, the sources are not extended beyond the gaussian beam shape, and the sources were not given any angular clustering. The artificial images represent high optimism.

The background levels in the four images were fit by sigma-clipping (ie, iteratively removing outlier pixels) at 3-sigma and they were subtracted from the images. Although the input background levels were zero, the fit levels are above zero for all of the images because of the integrated flux from all the unresolved sources. In almost all real observations but especially at wavelengths longer than the near-ultraviolet (ground-based) or visual (space-based), images contain large DC levels from sky emission or telescope thermal emission so the true background (or, more accurately, foreground) is unknown and must be fit by a procedure similar to the sigma-clipping used here. For $\beta \geq 1.0$, the background levels do not converge, in the sense that the background light is dominated by the faintest sources, and in these artificial images the background level is just set by the depth to which the artificial source catalogs go. However, experiments involving changing this depth show that the confusion noise or level of background modulation in the artificial images has converged.

Note that the sigma-clipping background estimation technique is equivalent to (although less subjective than) estimating the background from regions of the image that appear empty or blank.

At each location of a source in the artificial source catalog, a centroid is found in the artificial image in a box of side length $2\theta_{\text{FWHM}}$ centered on the artificial source location in the catalog. These centroids are what will be referred to as the “measured” positions.

The source positions measured by centroiding are in general shifted from the true positions in the artificial source catalog; sometimes this is because there is a brighter source nearby that is blending with the fainter source of interest, sometimes this is just because the

source is projected onto the roiling sea of unresolved, fainter sources. Only the latter effect is properly an effect of confusion noise. For this reason, sources with measured positions closer than $2\theta_{\text{FWHM}}$ from a brighter source were dropped from the analysis that follows. This exclusion of measured faint sources near brighter sources removes many of the largest deviations of measured from true positions, especially for the artificial images with $\beta < 1$, where bright sources dominate.

The centroid errors for the remaining sources, in units of the beam’s half-width at half maximum (HWHM) are shown in Figure 2 as a function of the confusion level, or number of sources per beam s/b . A running median and a running 90 percent level are also shown. The results are dramatic. For $\beta = 1.5$, which is the typical count slope for submillimeter sources or nearby stars, measured source positions are occasionally displaced from their true source positions by a significant fraction of the half-power point of the beam even at $s/b = 1/100$; such displacements are common at $s/b = 1/50$. The rule-of-thumb is appropriate for $\beta \sim 0.75$, the typical count-slope for faint visual and infrared sources.

Crowding-induced centroid shifts have been observed in some microlensing events: As a faint lensed star becomes brighter, its apparent position shifts towards its true position because confusion noise becomes less important (Goldberg 1998; Goldberg & Woźniak 1998).

For each measured source, the gaussian beam shape is fit to the peak in a square box of side length $2\theta_{\text{FWHM}}$ centered on the measured centroid. This provides a measured flux. The measured and true fluxes are compared in Figure 3. The flux errors become bad at roughly the same source per beam levels as the position errors. Note also that at the faint end there is a bias in the median flux error, caused by the subtraction of a finite background from the images. This bias will exist in all observations that are analyzed after background subtraction (all visual and near-infrared images) and all observations made with chopping (many infrared and submillimeter images).

3. Discussion of assumptions

As has been emphasized, this study makes use of very optimistic assumptions about the properties of the imaging data. An experiment was performed to test one of these assumptions: the perfectly gaussian beam. An image was made by “beam switching” with a nod of $3\theta_{\text{FWHM}}$ so that the beam consists of a central positive gaussian flanked by two negative gaussians of half the power but the same FWHM separated by angles of $\pm 3\theta_{\text{FWHM}}$ on either side. These parameters were chosen to roughly match typical

submillimeter observing strategies (eg, Eales et al 1999). In this artificial beam-switched image, at constant source per beam level, the median positional errors are typically ~ 50 percent worse than in the single gaussian beam artificial images. Pure gaussian beam may therefore be an unrealistically optimistic assumption, although it is close to correct for atmosphere-limited visual and near-infrared observations.

The assumption of point-like or non-extended sources is overly optimistic in ground-based and space-based optical imaging, where recent data is not, by and large, confusion limited. It is probably not a problem for recent submillimeter observations, which have a beam with $\theta_{\text{FWHM}} \approx 15$ arcsec. Unfortunately, a proper treatment of the effects of finite source sizes involves modeling distributions of sizes, radial profiles and shapes, all as a function of flux; this is outside the scope of this work.

The assumption that sources are unclustered is probably optimistic for virtually all deep imaging observations. Clustering becomes important whenever the angular correlation length is larger than or on the order of the beam size (eg, Barcons et al 1992), which is true for virtually all optical and near-infrared imaging. This condition is probably also met for the submillimeter sources, although at present the numbers of sources are too small for a direct measurement. Again, a full treatment requires parameterization of the angular clustering and its dependence on flux.

The assumption of power-law number–flux relation must be incorrect in detail, in the sense that the integrated flux from sources in a power law diverges either at the faint or bright end (or both). In particular, the $\beta = 1.5$ models presented here diverge in terms of total flux (although not in terms of fluctuations) at the faint end. Experiments of varying the depth to which the artificial source catalogs go have not shown significant changes in the error distributions. The errors are not dominated by the very faintest sources; they are dominated by the sources with fluxes which fall between the flux of the source in question and the level at which there is $s/b \sim 1$ source per beam. It is the number–flux relation in this region only which is important to the confusion noise.

4. Discussion of recent data

The deepest recent ground-based visual and near-infrared observations of blank sky are not confusion limited (eg, Djorgovski et al 1995; Hogg et al 1997). However, since they are in the region of $s/b = 1/50$ sources per beam, it does not make sense to perform deeper imaging until wide-field, ground-based adaptive optics can be used. Radio imaging has been confusion limited for some time (eg, Condon 1974) so radio surveys are usually

careful to truncate analyses before confusion noise becomes destructive. In all these fields of astronomy, telescope time is better spent increasing field area than depth. Although until the launch of Chandra essentially all deep x-ray imaging was confusion limited (eg, Barcons 1992), present-day space-based x-ray and optical imaging is not yet at the confusion limit (Williams et al 1996; Brandt et al in preparation). This may change with planned future instrumentation and exposures.

Unfortunately, several recent publications on faint mid-infrared and submillimeter sources have ignored confusion as a possible source of error and are beyond the confusion limit. This is particularly serious since the number count slopes are very steep ($2.0 < \beta < 1.5$) both observationally and according to simple models (Hughes et al 1998; Blain et al 1998; Barger et al 1999a; Aussel et al 1999; Elbaz et al 1999). One 850 μm study shows sources to $s/b \sim 1/11$ (Hughes et al 1998) and others show sources to $s/b \sim 1/50$ (Smail et al 1998; Eales et al 1999). The ISO counts at 15 μm have been pushed to $s/b \sim 1/25$ (Aussel et al 1999). The fact that a significant fraction of the submillimeter sources show no striking visual counterparts is not at all surprising; the submillimeter positions will be shifted from their true positions by more than the HWHM or 7.4 arcsec. The authors generally consider only a region of radius $\sim \theta_{\text{HWHM}}/(S/N)$ where (S/N) is the estimated signal-to-noise ratio of the detection; these radii are generally 2 to 4 arcsec (Hughes et al 1998; Smail et al 1998; Barger et al 1999b). The results of the analysis presented here suggests that these authors should be looking in a region a factor of 4 to 10 larger in solid angle.

It might be hoped that confusion is not so destructive because perhaps the true mid-infrared and submillimeter source number–flux relations are not nearly as steep as what is measured and modeled. However, if so, many of the faintest reported sources must truly be spurious. One phenomenological model (Barger et al 1999a) shows the number–flux relation flattening just below the faintest detected sources, but it does not flatten quickly enough to solve the confusion problem. Future imaging efforts would be better spent increasing field area than exposure times, and counterparts ought to be sought in large error boxes.

A recent comprehensive review (Blain et al 1998) estimates the flux levels at which future ground- and space-based infrared through radio surveys will become confusion limited, using the incorrect criterion of $s/b = 1$ source per beam. Their limiting flux levels become more realistic when multiplied by a factor of ~ 30 to bring the surface densities down to the confusion noise limits presented here.

Another area in which deep imaging in crowded fields is necessary is studies of the Galactic center (eg, Eckart & Genzel 1997; Genzel et al 1997; Ghez et al 1998). In

these studies, accurate astrometry is needed not just for identifying counterparts at other wavelengths, but also for measuring proper motions, on the basis of which the central black hole mass is estimated. Current analyses of the Galactic center go to more crowded depths than $s/b = 10$ sources per beam in the central 1 arcsec². It may be important for the Galactic center investigators to show that the large proper motions they observe are truly the motions of individual bright stars and not seriously affected by many small motions in the underlying sea of unresolved sources. If the detected motions have a significant confusion-induced component, it can be predicted that the stellar accelerations (which are expected to be measured soon) will deviate significantly from their gravitational expectations.

5. Conclusions

For typical faint imaging in the visual and near-infrared, in which number counts have the form $d \log N / d \log S = S^{-\beta}$ with $\beta \approx 0.75$, the confusion limit rule-of-thumb that imaging should not be pursued fainter than $s/b \sim 1/30$ sources per beam is correct, both for obtaining good positions and good photometry. Optimistic simulations show that positions and fluxes of sources more numerous than this condition are likely to have large uncertainties. When number counts are steep, with Euclidean $\beta = 1.5$ or steeper, the problem is even more severe and a better rule-of-thumb is something like $s/b \sim 1/100$.

Source identifications in one set of imaging data based on detections in another set will be affected by these confusion-induced astrometry errors. It is essential that surveys working near the confusion limit perform realistic simulations in order to draw conservative positional error boxes for source identification.

Gerry Neugebauer and Tom Soifer drummed the “30 beams per source” rule-of-thumb into my head. Useful comments and information came from Tal Alexander, John Bahcall, Roger Blandford, Tom Chester, Judy Cohen, Daniel Eisenstein, Tom Jarrett, Bruce Partridge, Eric Richards and Ian Smail. Financial support was provided under Hubble Fellowship grant HF-01093.01-97A from STScI, which is operated by AURA under NASA contract NAS 5-26555. This research made use of the NASA ADS Abstract Service.

REFERENCES

Aussel H., Cesarsky C. J., Elbaz D., Starck J. L., 1999, A&A, 342, 313

- Barcons X., 1992, *ApJ*, 396, 460
- Barger A. J., Cowie L. L., Sanders D. B., Fulton E., Taniguchi Y., Sato Y., Kawara K., Okuda H., 1998, *Nature*, 394, 248
- Barger A. J., Cowie L. L., Sanders D. B., 1999a, *ApJ*, 518, L5
- Barger A. J., Cowie L. L., Smail I., Ivison R. J., Blain A. W., Kneib J.-P., 1999b, *AJ*, 117, 2656
- Blain A. W., Ivison R. J., Smail I., 1998, *MNRAS*, 296, L29
- Condon J. J., 1974, *ApJ*, 188, 279
- Djorgovski S. et al, 1995, *ApJ*, 438, L13
- Eales S., Lilly S., Gear W., Dunne L., Bond J. R., Hammer F., Le Fèvre O., Crampton D., 1999, *ApJ*, 515, 518
- Eckart A., Genzel R., 1997, *MNRAS*, 284, 576
- Elbaz D. et al, 1999, *A&A*, 351, L37
- Franceschini A., 1982, *Ap&SS*, 86, 3
- Gardner J. P. et al, 2000, *AJ*, 119, 486
- Genzel R., Eckart A., Ott T., Eisenhauer F., 1997, *MNRAS*, 291, 219
- Ghez A. M., Klein B. L., Morris M., Becklin E. E., 1998, *ApJ*, 509, 676
- Goldberg D. M., 1998, *ApJ*, 498, 156
- Goldberg D. M., Woźniak P. R., 1998, *Acta Astronomica*, 48, 19
- Hacking P., Houck J. R., 1987, *ApJS*, 63, 311
- Hogg D. W., Pahre M. A., McCarthy J. K., Cohen J. G., Blandford R., Smail I., Soifer B. T., 1997, *MNRAS*, 288, 404
- Hughes D. H. et al, 1998, *Nature*, 394, 241
- Rajagopal J., Allen R. J., 2000, in *Working on the Fringe: An International Conference on Optical and IR Interferometry from Ground and Space*, eds. Unwin S., Stachnik R., ASP Conference Series, in press
- Richards E. A., Kellerman K. I., Fomalont E. B., Windhorst R. A., Partridge R. B., 1998, *AJ*, 116, 1039
- Rowan-Robinson M. et al, 1997, *MNRAS*, 289, 490
- Scheuer P. A. G., 1957, *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.*, 53, 764
- Smail I., Ivison R. J., Blain A. W., Kneib J.-P., 1998, *ApJ*, 507, L21

Williams R. E. et al, 1996, AJ, 112, 1335

Yu J. W., Shaklan S. B., Shao M., 1993, Proc. SPIE, 1947, 209




Fig. 1.— The four artificial images, labeled by the number-count exponent β (see text for definition). The images are stretched so that a source at the $s/b = 1/30$ source per beam level appears the same in all images.




Fig. 2.— Astrometry (position) errors as a function of the number of sources per beam, given in terms of the beam HWHM. These positional errors can be thought-of as really being as a function of flux, but where for clarity the flux is given not in Jy but by the source density s/b to that flux level. The lower line is a running median and the upper line is a running 90-percent line. The panels are labeled by number count slope β (see text for definition). The median positional error in the $\beta = 1.5$ case is roughly $0.6 \theta_{\text{HWHM}}$ for sources with fluxes such that a catalog to that level would contain $s/b = 1/30$ of a source per beam.




Fig. 3.— Fractional flux errors as a function of the number of sources per beam. The middle line is a running median and the upper and lower lines are running 10 and 90-percent lines. The panels are labeled by number count slope β (see text for definition).